RECEIVED

Law Offices

HENRY E. CRAWFORD JUN - 5 1997

SUITE 900

1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, Note that Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20036 Office of Secretary

202-862-4395

Telecopier Number 202-828-4130

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

June 5, 1997

BY HAND DELIVERY

E-Mail: crawlaw@wizard.net

Web: http://www.wizard.net/~crawlaw

Mr. William F. Caton Acting Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

Re:

In the Matter of

Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings

File No.: GC Docket No. 97-113

Dear Mr. Caton:

Transmitted herewith on behalf of The Law Offices of Henry Crawford are an original and six (6) copies of its "Reply Comments of the Law Offices of Henry E. Crawford" as directed to the Commission.

Should any additional information be required, please contact this office.

Very truly yours

Henry E. Crawford

No. of Copies rec'd_ List A B C D E

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RECEIVED WASHINGTON, D.C.

JUN - 5 1997

In the Matter of

Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings

To: The Commission

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

GC Docket No. 97-113

REPLY COMMENTS OF THE LAW OFFICES OF HENRY E. CRAWFORD

Henry E. Crawford

Law Offices of Henry E. Crawford 1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 862-4395

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE	E OF CONTENTS	i
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Browser Compatibility	1
III.	Document Format	3

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Federal Communications Commission Office of Secretary

In the Matter of

Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings

GC Docket No. 97-113

To: The Commission

REPLY COMMENTS OF THE LAW OFFICES OF HENRY E. CRAWFORD

The Law Offices of Henry E. Crawford, respectfully submits its Reply Comments in the above-captioned proceeding. In support thereof, the following is stated:

Introduction

1. A review of the comments shows that many commentors are in agreement that some sort of security system is required. In our comments, we argued for a registration database system with password protection. Many commentors also expressed proposals similar to those offered by this firm. However, two points need to be addressed at this stage of the proceeding.

II. **Browser Compatibility**

2. In comments, we argued for an open architecture that would allow users to upload, search and download without regard to any particular web browser. Unfortunately, our concern in this regard has been shown to be substantial. After several unsuccessful attempts to upload comments to the site, we learned that the system does not work with Microsoft's Internet Explorer.

Uploading, searching and downloading cannot be performed with Internet Explorer. Electronic filing was only possible by attaching the document to an email directed to the Commission.

- 3. Limiting access to users of a single web browser defeats the usefulness of the site. Internet Explorer is offered at no cost. Consequently, excluding users of this software would unfairly deprive use of the site to those unable to afford expensive browser software. Also, users unaware of this limitation could find themselves ambushed at a filing deadline and left unable to file timely comments. Since the system does not openly state that users can only use a specific web browser, the cause of the failure would not be clear to the end user.
- 4. The Commission cannot expect users to maintain multiple browsers on their systems. Browser software has steadily grown in size and maintaining two browsers would present a highly inefficient demand on system resources. Moreover, browser software is presently evolving into full integration with the users operating system. This will further undermine the ability to run multiple web browsers. Finally, the manufactures of browser software often appear before the Commission on a substantive basis; a decision by the Commission to support only one company's software could be perceived as an endorsement of that company. It would be somewhat analogous to the Commission opening up a telephone information line and then limiting it only to the subscribers of a particular common carrier.

5. In sum, if the Commission is to go forward with electronic filing, it must be made accessible to all users, regardless of browser software. If that cannot be accomplished on the web (and there is no reason why it cannot), then a more simplified system would be in order. An electronic BBS with an "800" number could easily handle all the demands of electronic filing using the most generic communications software. While this approach would have its own drawbacks, it is preferable to one that excludes users that do not use particular browser software.

III. Document Format

6. While several commentors noted the need for an open document format, others argued for particular document formats. Among these, ASCII is too simplistic to capture the complexity of most legal filings. No special document formatting is supported and footnotes cannot be easily inserted into documents. Nor should the Commission require filings in Adobe Acrobat. Virtually no firms use that software as a native document creation tool. While documents could be converted into Adobe format, that requires a licensed copy of the software that could cost in the hundreds of dollars. While the PDF format may be useful for viewing documents within a web browser, it should be confined to this alone. Users should still be able to upload and download documents in all modern word processor formats.

WHEREFORE, the Law Offices of Henry E. Crawford respectfully submits

its reply comments herein.

June 5, 1997

Law Offices of Henry E. Crawford, Esq. 1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 862-4395

E-Mail: crawlaw@wizard.net

Web: http://www.wizard.net/~crawlaw

Respectfully Submitted,

Henry E. Crawford